ISSUES/OPTIONS FOR MONITORING TRADE OF SWORDFISH AND BIGEYE TUNA

What we have:

Bluefin tuna	Swordfish	Bigeye Tuna
Statistical Document -tracks every shipment - if fish are tagged, can track individual fish - tracks imports, exports, re-exports -ocean of origin -flag of harvesting vessel -stamp of approved gov't official for export (not needed if fish tagged) -importer/exporter certification -product form -point of export/import	Certificate of Eligibility -tracks every shipment -tracks imports -ocean of origin -flag of harvesting vessel -stamp of any gov't official for export -exporter certification about no small Atl. swordfish -importer puts on 7501 form #	
Bi-weekly ABT Dealer Report - (also for imports/exports of Pacific BFT) -date of landing or import -dealer -weight -price per pound -quality ratings (optional) -destination of fish (import, export, U.S. market, re-export) -vessel permit #	Bi-weekly dealer reporting: SWO Importer activities -date of import -dealer -weight of each H&G fish -price per lb/kg -entry # from Customs 7501 form -condition (fresh/frozen) -product form -attached COEs	Bi-weekly dealer reporting for HMS Proposed mandatory bi-weekly reporting of BAYS tunas purchases from U.S. vessels. Reporting is already mandatory if purchased along with sharks/swords. No importer permitting/reporting
Customs data -every shipment -country of export -point of import -product form	Customs data -every shipment -country of export -point of import -product form	Customs data -every shipment -country of export -point of import -product form

What we need:

	Bluefin tuna	Swordfish	Bigeye Tuna
To enforce trade restrictions by country	-ocean of origin -flag of harvesting vessel	-ocean of origin -flag of harvesting vessel	-ocean of origin -flag of harvesting vessel
To enforce no sale ban on undersized fish		-certification of no small swordfish	
To enforce stock-specific quotas	-stock/area of origin	-stock/area of origin	

Options for Swordfish and Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document Programs

1. Use one document for all three species (and possibly others in the future)

PROS: Less confusing to administer the program using one form, reduced PRA burden. More efficiently administered by NMFS as one program.

CONS: Could be a complicated form. Would need to indicate which species should be included, and differences in trade patterns between tunas (mostly exports for U.S.) and swordfish (mostly imports for U.S.) would further confuse use of one form for all three species. Also, ocean areas for each species would need to be indicated. Government validation could be a problem for bigeye - it's currently waived for the BSD if tagging program is in place - tagging program for bigeye or certification of dealers/validators would have to be instituted.

2. Use one document for bigeye and bluefin tuna, another for swordfish

PROS: Bigeye and bluefin tuna are shipped in similar ways; fresh, with few fish per box/shipment; most of shipping world-wide is to Japan. These similarities would allow for easy sharing of the form. The form may not need to be changed at all, with the exception of the title and instructions to indicate that bigeye need to be included. Swordfish are shipped and processed differently, in many cases, and world-wide trading patterns of swordfish are different from that of tunas.

CONS: What about combined shipments of species (e.g., swordfish and bigeye)? May be confusing and inefficient to have two programs, although BFT/BET could be administered by NERO-HMS and SWO could be administered by SERO-HMS. Problem with government validation for bigeye (see above) would still apply here. If no tagging program, then gov't validation would be necessary. There still may be some confusion using one form for two species. Also, the Japanese may object to using one form for both, as they were/are very particular about having the details of the BSD be consistent (i.e., ocean area of catch) be specific to the BFT management system.

3. Use a separate document for each species

PROS: Easy to understand - one form per species.

CONS: This option may contrast with ICCAT's stated desire to harmonize these programs, although "harmonize" does not necessarily mean "combine". Could harmonize somehow (similar information collected) but not completely (different forms) under this option; could be more difficult to administer three separate programs; constituents might be confused as to which form they need, what about combined shipments? Increased PRA requirements.

Swordfish/Bigeye Tuna Certificate of Eligibility

Date:
I,
Swordfish Shipment (check one below)
[] (a) Contains no swordfish harvested from the Atlantic Ocean.
[] (b) Contains no swordfish or pieces of swordfish harvested from the Atlantic Ocean that are less than 33 lb. (15 kg).
[] (c) Contains pieces of swordfish harvested from the Atlantic Ocean that are less than 33 lb. (15 kg) that were derived from a swordfish that weighed greater than 33 lb. (15 kg) dressed weight.
[] Check here for swordfish shipment
I further certify that such swordfish were caught in the waters of the
[] Check here for bigeye tuna shipment
I further certify that such bigeye tuna were caught in the waters of the (Atlantic, Pacific, Indian) Ocean by a vessel bearing the flag of (nation)
Signature/title/agency of government official or authorized person
SEAL/STAMP below
Address
Form 7501 Entry # (to be added by importe

Importer: Please submit this form to NMFS with the appropriate bi-weekly dealer report form that documents this swordfish/bigeye tuna shipment.